REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-15 stand rejected. Claims 5, 12 and 16 were objected to. Claims 1, 10, 13 and 14 are amended through this response. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-16.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-16 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of copending Application No. 10/534,623.

As indicated by the Examiner at page 2, paragraph 1, of the Office Action, a "timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent . . . is shown to be commonly owned with this application." It is respectfully submitted that this application as well as copending patent application no. 10/534,623, are commonly owned. Therefore, a terminal disclaimer will be filed to overcome this rejection.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (US Patent: 7,030,846) in view of Stokes et al. (US Patent 6,628,828), further in view of Moon et al. (US Patent 6,762,742).

For Claims 1, 10 and 13: Claims 1, 10 and 13 are patentable over Lee in view of Stokes and further in view of Moon because the combination of these three references does not teach all of the limitations in Claims 1, 10 and 13.

-6-

First of all, the combination of Lee, Stokes and Moon does not teach

> a gamma converter converting input image data into output image data that have gamma characteristic adapted to a gamma 2.2 curve and have a bit number greater than the input image data,

> a color correction unit including color correction coefficients for performing color correction on the image data from the gamma converter, the color correction coefficients determined depending on color represented by the liquid crystal display.

The Examiner admits that "Lee does not explicitly teach including a gamma converter outputting output image data based on the input image data..." and relied on Stokes to disclose the gamma converter. Specifically, page 9 of the Office Action indicates that Stokes' gamma correction 104 corresponds to the "gamma converter" of Claim 1, citing to Stokes' column 7, lines 20-21. However, nothing in this cited section teaches or suggests that Stokes' gamma correction 104 "*[has] a bit number greater than the input image data*" (emphasis added). The cited section talks about converting the color object from a space that has a gamma of 1.0 to the space that has a gamma of 2.2, which does not relate to bit number expansion. Stokes does not disclose the image data inputted into the gamma converter 104 having a bit number smaller than the image data outputted from the gamma converter 104. It should also be noted that Stokes relates to user software or hardware used for converting images, and does not disclose a color correction method adapted to the characteristics of a display device.

Furthermore, the Examiner states that Lee discloses "a signal controller (100) with a bit number (i.e. 8 bit) smaller than the output image data." Pages 9, 11 and 12 of the Office Action indicate that the Examiner reads Lee's R, G, and B data corrections units (112, 114, 116) as corresponding to "the color correction unit" of Claims 1, 10 and 13. Pages 9, 11 and 12 of the Office Action also indicate that the Examiner reads Lee's timing control unit 100 as corresponding to "the signal controller" of Claims 1, 10 and 13, and that the signal controller discloses bit number expansion. However, the signal controller (100) in Lee does not actually output signals that have different bit numbers from the input data. As shown in Fig. 8 of Lee, the bit numbers of both the input and output signals from the signal controller (100) and the

-7-

color correction unit (110) are 8 bits. The data correction units (112, 114, and 116) in Lee output signals that have different bit numbers from the input signal. However, according to the Examiner's reading, the data correction units correspond to the color correction unit as recited in Claims 1, 10 and 13, and not the gamma converter. Since bit number changing is not recited in connection to the color correction unit and Lee does not disclose a gamma converter, Lee does not cure Stokes' failure to disclose "a gamma converter converting input image data into output image data that have ... a bit number greater than the input image data."

Hence, Lee in view of Stokes and further in view of Moon does not disclose the gamma converter recited in Claims 1, 10 and 13. Claims 1, 10 and 13 are patentable over Lee in combination of Stokes and Moon. Applicants respectfully request the 103 rejection to Claims 1, 10 and 13 be withdrawn.

For Claim 14. The Examiner states that Claim 14 "is a method of claim 1 and is rejected on the same grounds." Office Action at page 13. As discussed above with respect to claims 1, 10 and 13, the cited references fail to disclose "converting gamma characteristic of input image data to be adapted to a gamma 2.2 curve and having a bit number greater than the input image data," as recited, in part, in claim 14. As discussed above, as shown in Figure 8 of Lee, the bit numbers of both the input and the output of the signal controller (100) and the color correction unit (110) are the same, 8 bits, not different. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the 103 rejection to Claim 14 be withdrawn.

For Claims 2-4 and 6-9: Claims 2-4 and 6-9 depend from Claim 1 and are patentable at least for the reason of dependency on Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the 103 rejections to Claims 2-4 and 6-9 be withdrawn.

For Claim 11: Claim 11 depends from Claim 10 and is patentable at least for the reason of dependency on Claim 10. Applicants respectfully request the 103 rejection to Claim 11 be withdrawn.

For Claim 15: Claim 15 depends from Claim 14 and is patentable at least for the reason of dependency on Claim 14. Applicants respectfully request the 103 rejection to Claim 15 be withdrawn.

-8-

AB-1707 US
10/534,622

Allowable Subject Matter

Examiner states that "Claims 5, 12 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." The indicated allowability of Claims 5, 12 and 16 is noted and appreciated. However, Applicants firmly believe that Claims 1, 10 and 14 are allowable, and Claims 5, 12 and 16 are allowable in dependent forms for at least the reason of dependency on Claims 1, 10 and 14 respectively. Applicants respectfully request that Claims 5, 12 and 16 be allowed in dependent forms.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that all rejections be withdrawn and that all of the pending claims be allowed. Should any other action be contemplated by the Examiner, it is respectfully requested that he contact the undersigned at (949) 752-7040 to discuss the application.

Via Facsimile Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the U.S. Patent Office on the date indicated below:

Saundra Carr   _9-22-08_
Saundra Carr   Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Alma P. Levy
Alma P. Levy
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 43,751

-9-